



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/849,854	05/04/2001	Dennis S. Chrobak	6700-1	9836
21324	7590	12/03/2003	EXAMINER	
HAHN LOESER & PARKS, LLP TWIN OAKS ESTATE 1225 W. MARKET STREET AKRON, OH 44313			JOHNSTONE, ADRIENNE C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1733	

DATE MAILED: 12/03/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/849,854

Applicant(s)

CHROBAK, DENNIS S.

Examiner

Adrienne C. Johnstone

Art Unit

1733

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 September 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 3-10 and 22-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 3-7 and 22-24 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 8-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Claim 24 stands withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made without traverse in Paper No. 3 (see paragraph 8 in the Office action mailed February 28, 2003 (Paper Number 6)).

2. Newly submitted claims 3-7, 22, and 23 as amended are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons:

1) Instant claim 3 no longer requires the toroidal body to be *an integral homogeneous* toroidal body but now requires *a thickened area at the first end of each of the sidewalls, the thickened area including the rim-engaging surfaces* rather than the rim-engaging surfaces including a lobe-like portion or projection.

2) Instant claim 22 no longer requires the toroidal body to be *an integral homogeneous* toroidal body or the rim-engaging surfaces to include *a lobe-like projection* but now newly recites that *the sidewalls have a generally concave configuration when the tire is mounted on the rim*.

3) The inventions are therefore related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. In the instant case, the invention of instant claims 3-7 has separate utility such as a tire which is not an integral homogeneous toroidal body but which has a thickened area at the first end of each of the sidewalls, the thickened area including the rim-engaging surfaces, and the invention of instant claims 22 and 23 has separate utility such as a tire which is not an integral homogeneous toroidal body and does not have rim-engaging surfaces including a lobe-like projection but which includes sidewalls having a generally concave configuration when the tire is mounted on the rim. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

Art Unit 1733

4) Concerning claims 3-7, because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for the instant claims 3-7 was not required for the previously examined invention (for example 152/544), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

5) Concerning claims 22 and 23, because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper (see for example Vale (1,335,469) in which the tire is not an integral homogeneous toroidal body and the rim engaging surfaces do not include a lobe-like projection but the sidewalls have a generally concave configuration when the tire is mounted on the rim).

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 3-7, 22, and 23 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Inventorship

3. In view of the papers filed September 12, 2003, it has been found that this nonprovisional application, as filed, through error and without deceptive intent, improperly set forth the inventorship, and accordingly, this application has been corrected in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(a). The inventorship of this application has been changed by the addition of James A. Chrobak.

The application will be forwarded to the Office of Initial Patent Examination (OIPE) for issuance of a corrected filing receipt, and correction of the file jacket and PTO PALM data to reflect the inventorship as corrected.

Art Unit 1733

Specification

4. The abstract of the disclosure does not commence on a separate sheet in accordance with 37 CFR 1.52(b)(4). A new abstract of the disclosure is required and must be presented on a separate sheet, apart from any other text.

5. The amendment filed September 12, 2003 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132 because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132 states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: in replacement paragraph 0017 the examiner cannot ascertain where there is support in the original disclosure for the lobe-like thickened portions 30 "narrowing in cross section for the sidewall to its end" and applicants have not pointed out support for this addition.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

7. Claims 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed

Art Unit 1733

invention. This is both a new matter rejection and a lack of adequate written description rejection.

The examiner cannot ascertain where in the original disclosure there is support for the requirement of *a thickened area at the first end of each of the sidewalls, the thickened area including the rim-engaging surfaces* rather than the rim-engaging surfaces including a lobe-like portion or projection, and applicants have not pointed out support for this change. Further, if the lobe-like projections or portions recited in the original disclosure are not defined as the somewhat rounded thickened projections which one of ordinary skill in the art would have understood from the original disclosure as a whole, one of ordinary skill in the art would not know the meaning of the term "lobe-like" as applied to the lobe-like projections or portions recited in the original disclosure.

One way to overcome this rejection would be to file a continuation-in-part application which adequately defines the lobe-like projections or portions.

8. Claims 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. See paragraph 7 above - this is for the case where applicants reinstate the original "lobe-like" projections or portions without confirming the definition as the somewhat rounded thickened projections which one of ordinary skill in the art would have understood from the original disclosure as a whole.

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Once the rejections in paragraphs 7 and 8 are overcome, claims 8-10 would receive favorable consideration as set forth in paragraph 25 of the Office action mailed February 28, 2003 (Paper Number 6).

Art Unit 1733

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Adrienne C. Johnstone whose telephone number is (703)308-2059. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 10:00AM-6:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Crispino can be reached on (703)308-3853. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703)872-9311.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-0661.

Adrienne C. Johnstone
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1733

Adrienne Johnstone

December 1, 2003

